

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_116569
Title of the Manuscript:	Physicochemical Characteristics of Set Yogurt Fortified with Dracaena angustifolia Leaves Extract
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, manuscript appears to be significant for the scientific community. This research could contribute to the broader understanding of utilizing plant extracts in dairy products, which aligns with current interests in functional foods and natural additives. The study's focus on physicochemical characteristics indicates a detailed examination of how this extract affects yogurt's properties, which is valuable for researchers and practitioners in food science and nutrition.</p> <p>Yes title is suitable. But if you want alternative one then you could consider: "Enhancing Set Yogurt with Dracaena angustifolia Leaf Extract: Physicochemical Insights" This alternative title maintains the focus on the fortification of yogurt with the extract while highlighting the scientific investigation into its physicochemical effects.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Acknowledgement, competing interest and author's contribution sections are not mentioned in the paper. Other subsections are ok.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes references are sufficient</p> <p>For research paper according to journal guidelines the words limit should be 3000 to 6000 overall but this manuscript is crossing 7000 words. In short maximum 1400 words are extra. 46 words are extra in abstract. Because the required words are 300.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall the results and manuscript is very good and also according to journal guidelines except few of sections which I mentioned above.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sumia Urainab
Department, University & Country	Government College University, Pakistan